UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,633	06/18/2001	Yuriko Tamura	SNY-P4406.01	2446

24337 7590 05/18/2005	EXAMINER
MILLER PATENT SERVICES	LEMMA, SAMSON B
2500 DOCKERY LANE	

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RALEIGH, NC 27606	2132	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/883,633	TAMURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samson B. Lemma	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 March 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-79* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-79* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in replay to an amendment filed on March 01, 2005.

Claims 1-79 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's argument filed on January 03, 2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The first argument by the applicant is about the independent claims 1 includes

limitations that are not shown or suggested by the combinations of the references on

the record, namely Slattery and Muratani.

Applicant argued that the office action failed to adequately explain the use of the

primary reference on the record, particularly Slattery. Applicant recited the following

in support of his argument, "reference to figure 2 reveals that two separate

encryptor/decryptor devices 115 and 170 appear in the figure in different locations

in order to sever two different encryption/decryption functions. It is unclear which

is supposed to perform the same function in the same manner as claimed." Finally

in his first argument applicant recited the following, "It is noted that in order to read

a reference on the claims, it must not only contain each and every elements of the

claims, but must have those elements interconnected and functioning in the

manner claimed." **"While Slattery has certain features resembling some of the**

claim elements these features are not connected in the same manner required

by the claims and do not carry out the same functions as required by the

claims."

Examiner disagrees with this argument.

Examiner would shortly show how the features not only resemble the claim

limitation but they are actually disclosed and connected in the same manner

required by the claims. In order to clarify the examiner respond, it would be

necessary to consider each and every limitation of the claim 1 and the applicant

argument with respect to each limitation.

Claim 1, first requires an external storage device for a STB or PVR (personal

video recorder).

The applicant argued that the cited text in support of this preamble is not related

to an external storage device but to a remultiplexer deivce for which elements 50

and 60 are simple source and destinations for the transport stream of remultiplexer

30.

Examiner disagrees with this argument.

The examiner would point out that Slattery discloses the following, "These sources

50 and destinations 60 may themselves be implemented as PC compatible

computers. However, the sources 50 may also be devices such as cameras, video

tape players, communication demodulators/receivers and the destinations may be

display monitors, **video tape recorders**, communications modulators/transmitters,

etc. The data injection sources 50 supply TS, ES or other data to the remultiplexer

30, e.g., for remultiplexing into the outputted TSs TS4 and/or TS5. Likewise, the

data extraction destinations 60 receive TS, ES or other data from the remultiplexer

30, e.g., that is extracted from the inputted TSs TS1, TS2 and/or TS3. For example,

one data injection source 50 may be provided for producing each of the inputted, to-

be-remultiplexed TSs, TS1, TS2 and TS3 and one data extraction destination 60

may be provided for receiving each outputted remultiplexed TS TS4 and TS5."

[Column 13, lines 11-24]. The remultiplexer has an external storage device as

shown on figure 1, reference 40 and it has also another external storage device as

shown on figure 2, reference 120 and slattery discloses the external storage as

follows, "The host memory or the external memory for PVR shown on figure 2,

reference 120 is for storing transport packets and descriptors associated therewith.

The host memory 120 storage locations are organized as follows." [Column 16, lines

16-18] and an additional storage device for the PVR is provided as shown on figure

1, reference 40 and slattery discloses the following, "The storage device 40 can

produce TSs or data as inputted, to-be-remultiplexed information for remultiplexing

into the outputted TSs TS4 or TS5 by the remultiplexer 30. Likewise, the storage

device 40 can store TSs information or data produced by the remultiplexer 30, such

as transport packets extracted or copied from the inputted TSs TS1, TS2 or TS3,

other information received at the remultiplexer 30 or information generated by the

remultiplexer 30." [Column 12, lines 65-column 13, line 7]. The remultiplexer is

used for the purpose of selective modification of the content of a TS, such as adding

transport packets to a TS, deleting transport packets from a TS, rearranging the

ordering of transport packets in a TS and/or modifying the data contained in

transport packets as explained on [**column 4, lines 62-67**].

Therefore as explained above providing an external storage for the PVR

(personal video recorder) is disclosed by the reference on the record.

The applicant next argument is in relation of the 2ⁿᵈ limitation in claim 1,

"means for receiving an encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream containing

only component having content related to a single program. The applicant argued

that the examiner admitted such limitation is not taught by that the reference on

the record."

Examiner disagrees with the above argument and the examiner would point out

that no admission was made in the first office action regarding this particular

limitation instead examiner cited the relevant places in the former office action. To

clarify the citation, the examiner would indicate the following, As shown on figure 2,

The data link control circuit 112 receives transport packets from an incoming

TS.[column 15, lines 32-33] and as explained on column 14, lines 59-62

Slattery further discloses that the cache 114 which is connected to the data link

layer shown on figure 2, stores **control word information for use in scrambling**

the transport packet. In addition to the processor 160, the cache 114 is accessed

by the data link control circuit 112, the DMA control circuit 116 and the optional

scrambler 115. On the top that Slattery discloses the following "When receiving

transport packets, the data link control circuit 112 **filters out and retains only**

selected transport packets received from the incoming TS as specified in a

downloadable filter map (provided by the processor 160). The data link control

circuit 112 discards each other transport packet ".[column 15, lines 34-39].

Therefore this meets the recitation that the above limitation.

The next limitation in claim 1, argued by the applicant is the following,

"decryptor that decrypts the filtered MPEG transport stream. The applicant argued

that it is unclear which decryptor is used and how it meets this claim limitation.

Examiner disagrees with the above argument and the examiner would point out

that Slattery discloses at least the following, "The processor 160 may use PMT

information to update a PID filter map used to discard transport packets of

programs not to be included in the remultiplexed TS, **to identify control words for**

descrambling ESs and to select subroutines for processing PCRs contained in

transport packets having PIDs as identified in the PMT. [Column 20, lines 28-33]

The next limitation in claim 1, is the demultiplexer that extracts the MPEG table from the MPEG transport stream and is admitted by the applicant to be shown by the reference on the record.

The applicant next argument is regarding to the fourth limitation that a formatter reinsert the MPEG table back into the filtered MPEG transport stream, with the reinserted table containing only information related to a single program. **The applicant argued that while there is suggestion** of modification of certain MPEG tables, the reference does not explicitly teach/suggest that the formatter reinserts a table containing only information related to a single program.

Examiner disagrees with the above argument and the examiner would point out that Slattery discloses the following in support of the examiners argument. Remultiplexing involves **the selective modification of the content of a TS**, such as **adding transport packets to a TS** a single program which could be TS1 or TS2, deleting transport packets from a TS, rearranging the ordering of transport packets in a TS and/or modifying the data contained in transport packets. For example, sometimes it is desirable to add transport packets containing a first program that is a first single program such as TS1 to a TS that contains other single program such at TS2. Such an operation involves more steps than simply adding the transport packets of the first single program. In the very least, the PSI, such as, the PAT or "Program Association Table" and PMT, must be modified so that it correctly references the contents of the TS.[column 4, lines 62-column 5, line 8; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, line 65-column 15, line 12], It is shown that the when receiving transport packets, the data link control circuit 112 filters out and retains only selected transport packets received from the incoming TS as specified in a downloadable filter map (provided by the processor 160). The data link control circuit 112 discards each other transport packet ".[column 15, lines 34-39] when

remultiplexing occurs the PAT table is modified as explained above before it is added

or reinserted to the filtered desired transport packet of a single program which is

either TS1 or TS2 and this meets the limitation of the claim. Just to make things

more understandable Slattery also discloses that the TS also carries program

specific information or (PSI) in transport packets. PSI is for identifying data of a

desired program or other information for assisting in decoding a program. A

program association table or "PAT" is provided which is carried in transport packets

with the PID 0x0000. The PAT correlates each program number with the PID of the

transport packets carrying program definitions for that single program.[Column 3,

lines 53-60]

**The other argument by the applicant is regarding the secondary reference that

has been used.** The examiner argued that the secondary reference namely

"Muratani" discloses that the scrambled digital video data supplied from the

network is filtered, descrambled and demultiplexed. [figure 15, ref. Num "113" and

ref. Num "130"]

**The other argument is regarding the secondary reference that has been used

and the argument by the applicant is in regarding the motivation to make the**

proposed combination by the examiner, and the applicant argued that the

motivation failed to explain the motivation.

In response to the above argument the examiner would indicate that the test for

obviousness is not whether the features of the references may be bodily

incorporated into the other to produce the claimed subject mater but simply what

the references make obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art. See In re Bozek.

163 USPQ 545. (CCPA 1969); In re Richman 165 USPQ 509, (CCPA 1970); In re

Beckum 169 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's last argument is regarding the claims that has used the references

referred in the office action as "5C Digital Transmission.

Applicants argued the combination with the above reference still fails to produce the

filtered transport stream and formatting as taught and claimed.

In response to the above argument by the applicant, the examiner replay discussed

for the independent claim 1 above is also valid towards this argument.

Therefore all the elements of the limitations is explicitly or implicitly suggested and

disclosed by the combinations of the references on the records and the rejection

remains valid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by
> the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-3;6-8;16-17;19-21;29-31;33-35;42-43;45-47;54;56-58;65-67** are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slattery et al. (hereinafter referred as

Slattery)(U.S. Patent No. 6,148,082) in view of Muratani et al. (hereinafter referred to as

Muratani) (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,451)

5.   __As per claims 1,16,29,42,54,65-67__ **Slattery** discloses an external storage device for a

personal video recorder (PVR) or television Set-Top Box (STB), (Column 13, lines 13-14; column

12, lines 65- column 13, line 7) comprising:

- Means for receiving an encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream, the filtered

  MPEG transport stream containing only components having content related to a single

  program; (Column 15, lines 32-38; column 14, lines 55-61;column 15, lines 64-column 16,

  line 2; column 17, lines 47-51)

- A decrypter that decrypts the encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream to produce

  a filtered MPEG transport stream;(column 14, lines 55-61;column 8, lines 34-45;column

  21, lines 48-55;figure 2, ref, Num "115"; figure 2, ref. Num "170")

- A demultiplexer that receives the filtered MPEG transport stream and extracts an MPEG

  table therefrom; (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-column 4, line 20)

- A formatter that reinserts an MPEG table back into the filtered MPEG transport stream

to produce a modified MPEG transport stream, the reinserted table containing only information

relevant to the single program; and a disc drive that stores the modified MPEG transport

stream. (column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65-

column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

Slattery does not explicitly disclose that a demultiplexer is the one that receives the filtered

MPEG transport stream.

However, in the field of endeavor **Muratani** , discloses that scrambled digital video data

supplied from the network is filtered, descrambled and demultplexed. (figure 15, ref. Num

"113" and ref. Num "130")

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was

made, to combine the features of demultiplexer that receives the filtered digital video data as

per teachings of **Muratani** in to the method as taught by **Slattery**, in order to accommodate

the multimedia data which are communicated by multiplexing video data and audio according
to the system specification of the MPEG-2.

6.   **As per claims 2 and 30**, the combination of **Slattery** and **Muratani** discloses the
method as applied to claims 1 and 29 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the method
further comprising an encrypter that encrypts the modified transport stream. (Column 15,
lines 32-38; column 14, lines 55-61;column 15, lines 64-column 16, line 2; column 17, lines
47-51; figure 2, ref. Num "170" and figure 2, ref. Num "115)

7.   **As per claims 3, 17, 31, and 43**, the combination of **Slattery** and **Muratani** discloses
the method as applied to claims 1,16, 30 and 42 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the
method wherein the encrypter encrypts the modified transport stream prior to storage in the
disc drive so that the disc drive stores an encrypted version of the modified transport stream.
(column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15,
lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

8.   **As per claims 6, 19, 33, 45 and 56** the combination of **Slattery** and **Muratani**
discloses the method as applied to claims 1,17, 29, 42 and 54 above. Furthermore Slattery
discloses the method wherein the MPEG table comprises at least one of a program association
table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT). (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-
column 4, line 20)

9.   **As per claims 7,20,34,46 and 57** the combination of slattery and Muratani discloses the
method as applied to claims 1,17, 29, 42, and 54 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the
method wherein the demultiplexer extracts MPEG tables comprising a program association
table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT); (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-
column 4, line 20;) and

      wherein the formatter reinserts the MPEG PAT and PMT tables back into the filtered MPEG
transport stream to produce a modified MPEG transport stream, the reinserted tables

containing only information relevant to the single program. (column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7).

10.   **As per claims 8,21,35,47 and 58** the combination of slattery and Muratani discloses the method as applied to claims 1,17, 29, 42 and 54 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the method wherein the demultiplexer further extracts an entitlement control message (ECM) from the filtered transport stream. (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-column 4, line 20)

11.   **Claims 4-5;9-15;18,22-28;32;36-41;44;48-53;55,59-64;68-79 are** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slattery et al. (hereinafter referred as **Slattery**)(U.S. Patent No. 6,148,082) in view of **Muratani et al.** (hereinafter referred to as **Muratani**) (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,451) further in view of 5C Digital Transmission Content Protection White Paper (hereinafter referred to as **5C Digital Transmission**) (reference U)

12.   **As per claims 9-15; 22-28;36-41;48-53;59-64;68-69;73;77-79** Slattery discloses an external storage device for a personal video recorder (PVR) or television Set-Top Box (STB), (Column 13, lines 13-14; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7) comprising:

*   Means for receiving an encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream, the filtered MPEG transport stream containing only components having content related to a single program, (Column 15, lines 32-38; column 14, lines 55-61;column 15, lines 64-column 16, line 2; column 17, lines 47-51)

*   Wherein the encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream is received as isochronous data over an IEEE 1394 bus; (Figure 2, ref. Num "140", ref. Num "130")

- A decrypter that decrypts the encrypted and filtered MPEG transport stream using 5C decryption to produce a filtered MPEG transport stream (column 14, lines 55-61;column 8, lines 34-45;column 21, lines 48-55;figure 2, ref, Num "115"; figure 2, ref. Num "170") ;

- A demultiplexer that receives the filtered MPEG transport stream and extracts MPEG tables comprising a program association table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT) therefrom, and wherein the demultiplexer further extracts an entitlement control message (ECM) from the filtered transport stream;(Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53- column 4, line 20)

- Means for sending the MPEG tables extracted by the demultiplexer is sent to the PVR or STB over the IEEE 1394 bus as asynchronous data; (Figure 2, ref. Num "140", ref. Num "130")

- A formatter that reinserts the MPEG PAT and PMT tables back into the filtered MPEG transport stream to produce a modified MPEG transport stream, the reinserted tables containing only information relevant to the single program, (column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

- Wherein the formatter receives the MPEG table to be reinserted as asynchronous data over the IEEE 1394 bus; (Figure 2, ref. Num "140", ref. Num "130")

- An encrypter that encrypts the modified transport stream using 5C encryption;(figure 2, ref. Num "170" and figure 2, ref. Num "115")

- A disc drive that stores the encrypted modified MPEG transport stream; (column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

Slattery does not explicitly disclose that a demultiplexer is the one that receives the filtered

MPEG transport stream.

However, in the field of endeavor **Muratani** , discloses that scrambled digital video data

supplied from the network is filtered, descrambled and demultplexed. (figure 15, ref. Num

"113" and ref. Num "130")

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was

made, to combine the features of filter digital video data demultiplexed as per teachings of

Muratani in to the method as taught by **Slattery**, in order to accommodate the multimedia

data which are communicated by multiplexing video data and audio according to the system

specification of the MPEG-2.

The combinations of **Slattery and Muratani** does not explicitly disclose that

decrypter/encryptor used a 5C decryption and 5C encryption method and the bus used is "the

IEEE 1394 bus".

However, in the field of endeavor **5C digital Transmission**, discloses the members of the copy

protection Technical working group (CPTWG), Hitachi, Intel, Matsushita (MEI), Sony and

Toshiba have jointly produced the Five Company (5C) Digital Transmission content Protection

(DTCP) specification, providing manufactures with simple and inexpensive implementation. The

DTCP specification defines a cryptographic protocol for protecting audio/video entertainment

content from illegal copying, intercepting and tampering as it traverses a high performance

digital buses such as the IEEE 1394 standard. DTCP specification requires Hitachi's M6 as the

base line cipher. The M6 cipher used for encypt/decrypt content traversing the bus.(Page 1,

reference "Introduction", 1st and 2nd paragraph, page 2, under the title "Content Encryption").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was

made, to combine the 5c encryption/decryption algorithm recommended for the high

performance digital buses such as IEEE 1394 buses as per teachings of 5C Digital Trasmission in to the method as taught by **Slattery and Muratani**, in order to provide a simple and inexpensive implementation with a high degree of protection.

13.   **As per claims 4, 5, 18, 32, 44,55, 71 and 72,** the combination of **Slattery** and **Muratani** discloses an encrypter that encrypts the modified transport stream (figure 2, ref. Num "170" and figure 2, ref. Num "115"; column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

The combination **of Slattery** and **Muratan** does not explicitly disclose the encrypter encrypts the modified MPEG transport stream using 5C encryption.

However, in the field of endeavor **5C digital Transmission**, discloses the members of the copy protection Technical working group (CPTWG), Hitachi, Intel, Matsushita (MEI), Sony and Toshiba have jointly produced the Five Company (5C) Digital Transmission content Protection (DTCP) specification, providing manufactures with simple and inexpensive implementation. The DTCP specification defines a cryptographic protocol for protecting audio/video entertainment content from illegal copying, intercepting and tampering as it traverses a high performance digital buses such as the IEEE 1394 standard. DTCP specification requires Hitachi's M6 as the base line cipher. The M6 cipher used for encrypt/decrypt content traversing the bus.(Page 1, reference "Introduction", 1st and 2nd paragraph, page 2, under the title "Content Encryption").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the 5c encryption/decryption algorithm recommended for the high performance digital buses such as IEEE 1394 buses as per teachings of 5C Digital Transmission in to the method as taught by **Slattery and Muratani**, in order to provide a simple and inexpensive implementation with a high degree of protection.

14.   **As per claim 70,** the combination of Slattery, Muratani and 5C Digital Transmission discloses the method as applied to claims 68 above. Furthermore **Slattery** discloses the

method wherein the encrypter encrypts the modified transport stream prior to storage in the

disc drive so that the disc drive stores an encrypted version of the modified transport stream.

(column 4, line 61- column 5, line 6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15,

lines 2; column 12, lines 65- column 13, line 7)

15.   As per claim 74, the combination of Slattery, Muratani and 5C Digital Transmission

discloses the method as applied to claims 73 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the method

wherein the MPEG table comprises at least one of a program association table (PAT) and a

program map table (PMT). (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-column 4, line 20)

16.   **As per claim 75**, the combination of Slattery, Muratani and 5C Digital Transmission

discloses the method as applied to claims 73 above. Furthermore Slattery discloses the method

wherein wherein the demultiplexer extracts MPEG tables comprising a program association

table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT); (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-

column 4, line 20;) and

    wherein the formatter reinserts the MPEG PAT and PMT tables back into the filtered MPEG

transport stream to produce a modified MPEG transport stream, the reinserted tables

containing only information relevant to the single program. (column 4, line 61- column 5, line

6; column 32, lines 38-40; column 14, lines 65- column 15, lines 2; column 12, lines 65-

column 13, line 7).

17.   **As per claim 76**, the combination of Slattery, Muratani and 5C Digital Transmission

discloses the method as applied to claims 73 above. Furthermore Slattery the method wherein

the demultiplexer further extracts an entitlement control message (ECM) from the filtered

transport stream. (Column 20, lines 20-32;column 3, lines 53-column 4, line 20)

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy

as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Samson B Lemma whose telephone number is 571-272-

3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am---4: 30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, BARRON JR GILBERTO can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAMSON LEMMA

S·L·

GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

May 09, 2005